

REMARKS

The Office Action dated January 30, 2006 has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claim 1, 34, 37, 68 and 78 have been amended to place the subject matter in clear condition for allowance. No new matter has been added, and no new issues are raised which require further consideration and/or search. Claims 1-84 are submitted for consideration.

The Office Action indicated that claims 1-84 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. As to the rejection under paragraphs 4a-4f of the Office Action, Applicant submits that the claims are read in light of the specification. Page 10, line 19-page 11, line 10 of the specification discloses that a registration message and the level or type of access is sent from a visited one of a plurality of networks to the home network. Page 12 lines 2-5 discloses that the subscriber profile containing an authorized level or type of access, from a selected one of a plurality of subscriber profiles, is sent to the visited network for storage. Page 12, lines 7-11 disclose that control of access of the subscriber in the visited network is dependent on a comparison of the level or type of service which is sought to be provided to the subscriber and the stored subscriber profile of the authorized level or type of access. MPEP 2173.02 states that the claim language must be analyzed, not in a vacuum, but in light of the content of the particular application disclosure. Claims 1, 34, 37, 68 and 78 have been amended to

further clarify the subject matter recited in the claims. Therefore, in light of the amendments to the claims and the arguments presented above, Applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 37 and 68 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,697,806 (Cook). The rejection is traversed as being based on a reference that neither teaches nor suggests the novel combination of features clearly recited in independent claims 37 and 68.

Claim 37, upon which claims 38-67 depend, recites a method of controlling access of a subscriber to register in networks. The method includes during or after the subscriber registers in a network, providing an identification of the subscriber and an access of a plurality of accesses, to a visited network of a plurality of networks from a home network of the subscriber. The access includes an identification of access from the plurality of accesses to one of the plurality networks in which the subscriber is registered.

Claim 68, upon which claims 69-77 depend, recites a method of controlling access of a subscriber to register in networks. The method includes providing an identification of the subscriber, to a visited network of at least one of a plurality of networks from a home network. The method also includes in response to the providing of the identification of the subscriber, storing a subscriber profile of an access of a plurality of accesses to be provided to the subscriber in the visited network and using the stored subscriber profile in controlling service provided to the subscriber.

As will be discussed below, the cited prior art reference of Cook fails to disclose or suggest the elements of claims 37 and 68.

Cook discloses providing access between a user system and a plurality of communication networks. The plurality of communication networks provides services to a user in the user system and an access communication system includes a database system and an access server that is connected to the user system and the plurality of communications network. In one aspect, Cook discloses that the database system receives an update request from the access server to update a user access profile through inheritance. The database system then processes the update request to inherit user profile information from a user profile data structure. The database system updates the user access profile with the user profile information. In another aspect, Cook discloses that the database system receives user information and processes the user information to determine if a user access profile is local within a local database system. The database system generates and transmits a request to retrieve a user access profile from a second database system external to the local database system in response to the determination that the user access profile is not local. Col. 3, lines 15-50

Applicant submits that Cook simply does not teach or suggest each of the elements recited in claims 37 and 68. Claim 37 recites, in part, providing an identification of the subscriber and an access of a plurality of accesses, to a visited network of a plurality of networks from a home network of the subscriber, the access comprising an identification of access from the plurality of accesses to one of the plurality networks in which the

subscriber is registered. Claim 68 recites, in part, providing an identification of the subscriber, to a visited network of at least one of a plurality of networks from a home network, in response to the providing of the identification of the subscriber, storing a subscriber profile of an access of a plurality of accesses to be provided to the subscriber in the visited network and using the stored subscriber profile in controlling service provided to the subscriber. Cook merely teaches that the database system either inherits the user profile information from a user profile data structure or retrieves the user profile from an external system, if it is determined that the user profile is not local. There is no teaching or suggestion in Cook of providing an access including an identification of an access from the plurality of accesses to one of the plurality networks in which the subscriber is registered, as recited in claim 37 or storing a subscriber profile of an access of a plurality of accesses to be provided to the subscriber in the visited network and using the stored subscriber profile in controlling service provided to the subscriber, as recited in claim 68. Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) should be withdrawn because Cook fails to teach or suggest each feature of claims 37 and 68.

Claims 1, 34, 37, 68 and 78 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent 6,148,199 (Hoffman). The rejection is traversed as being based on a reference that neither teaches nor suggests the novel combination of features clearly recited in independent claims 1, 34, 37, 68 and 78, claims 37 and 68 being described above.

Claim 1, upon which claims 2-33 depend, recites a method of controlling access of a subscriber to a network. The method includes sending, from a visited network of a plurality of networks connected to a home network, an identification of the subscriber and an access to be provided to the subscriber. The method also includes in response to the identification of the subscriber and access to be provided to the subscriber, storing, in the visited network, a subscriber profile of an authorized access of a plurality of authorized accesses to be provided to the subscriber and controlling access of the subscriber to a network dependent upon a comparison of the access to be provided to the subscriber and the stored subscriber profile having the authorized access of the plurality of authorized accesses.

Claim 34, upon which claims 35 and 36 depend, recites a system which includes a home network which stores a plurality of subscriber profiles each defining an access to be provided to a subscriber of a network. The system also includes a plurality of networks connected to the home network and a subscriber equipment connected to a visited one of the plurality of networks through which the subscriber obtains an access to any network. In response to connection of the subscriber equipment to the visited network, an identification of the subscriber and an access to be provided to the subscriber is sent from the visited network to the home network and a subscriber profile of an authorized access of a plurality of authorized accesses to be provided to the subscriber is stored in one of the plurality of networks and access of the subscriber to the network is controlled by one of the plurality of networks storing the subscriber profile dependent upon a comparison

of the access to be provided to the subscriber and the stored subscriber profile having the authorized access of the plurality of authorized accesses.

Claim 78, upon which claims 79-84 depend, recites a system which includes networks in which a subscriber may register and a home network in which a plurality of subscriber profiles are stored, each of the profiles defining an access to be provided to the subscriber while registered in the networks. The system also includes a subscriber equipment which is connected to the networks while the subscriber is registered therein. In response to connection of the subscriber equipment to one of the networks at least an identification of the subscriber is provided from a visited network of the networks to the home network. A subscriber profile of an access of a plurality of accesses to be provided to the subscriber by at least one of the networks is stored, and the stored subscriber profile is used in controlling service provided to the subscriber.

As outlined below, Applicant submits that the cited reference of Hoffman does not teach or suggest the elements of claims 1, 34, 37, 68 and 78.

Hoffman discloses that a typical communications network includes a home location register (HLR) that includes user information, user profiles, feature activation status, and access privileges. When a network equipment receives a request for registration from a communication unit, the network equipment accesses the HLR, finds a corresponding subscriber record and determines what features to activate for the communication unit. The information is transferred to a visitor location register (VLR) which tracks the communication unit's location in the system.

Applicant submits that Hoffman does not teach or suggest any of the elements recited in claims 1, 34, 37, 68 and 78. Each of claims 1, 34, 37, 68 and 78 recite providing an identification of the subscriber and an access of a plurality of accesses, to a visited network of a plurality of networks from a home network of the subscriber, the access comprising an identification of access from the plurality of accesses to one of the plurality networks in which the subscriber is registered. There is no teaching or suggestion in Hoffman of providing an identification of the subscriber and an access of a plurality of accesses, to a visited network a home network of the subscriber, the access comprising an identification of access from the plurality of accesses to one of the plurality networks in which the subscriber is registered. Hoffman merely teaches that the HLR determines what feature need to be activated for a communication unit and sends the information to the VRL for the VLR to track the location of the communications unit. Claims 1, 34, 68 and 78, also recite that access of the subscriber to the network is dependent upon a comparison of the access to be provided to the subscriber and the stored subscriber profile having the authorized access of the plurality of authorized accesses. There is no teaching or suggestion in Hoffman of controlling subscriber access based on a comparison of the access to be provided to the subscriber and the stored subscriber profile having the authorized access of the plurality of authorized accesses, as recited in claims 1, 34, 68 and 78. Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn because Hoffman does not teach or suggest each feature of claims 1, 34, 37, 68 and 78.

Claims 1, 34, 37, 68 and 78 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent 6,745,029 (Lahtinen). The rejection is traversed as being based on a reference that neither teaches nor suggests the novel combination of features clearly recited in independent claims 1, 34, 37, 68 and 78, each of which is discussed above.

Lahtinen discloses that a subscriber moving from one network to another will have available all the supplementary network services that the subscriber's user terminal supports. Supplementary services are always associated with a certain amount of data which has to be stored in a permanent subscriber database and transferred to a system visited at a particular time. A method implemented in Lahtinen includes initiating by at least one user terminal the registration in the visited network which includes at least one network-specific supplementary service. The method also includes transferring the data relating to the common services of the home network and the visited network, in connection with the registration, from the subscriber database of the home network for temporary storage to the subscriber database of the visited network. Col. 2, lines 39-46 and Col. 3, lines 17-26.

Applicant submits that Lahtinen simply does not teach or suggest the combination of elements recited in claims 1, 34, 37, 68 and 78. Each of claims 1, 34, 37, 68 and 78 recite providing an identification of the subscriber and an access of a plurality of accesses, to a visited network of a plurality of networks from a home network of the subscriber, the access comprising an identification of access from the plurality of

accesses to one of the plurality networks in which the subscriber is registered. There is no teaching or suggestion in Lahtinen of providing an identification of the subscriber and an access of a plurality of accesses, to a visited network a home network of the subscriber, the access comprising an identification of access from the plurality of accesses to one of the plurality networks in which the subscriber is registered. Lahtinen merely teaches that a subscriber moving from one network to another will have available all the supplementary network services that the subscriber's user terminal supports. Claims 1, 34, 68 and 78, also recite that access of the subscriber to the network is dependent upon a comparison of the access to be provided to the subscriber and the stored subscriber profile having the authorized access of the plurality of authorized accesses. There is no teaching or suggestion in Lahtinen of controlling subscriber access based on a comparison of the access to be provided to the subscriber and the stored subscriber profile having the authorized access of the plurality of authorized accesses, as recited in claims 1, 34, 68 and 78. Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn because Lahtinen does not teach or suggest each feature of claims 1, 34, 37, 68 and 78.

Claims 1-31 and 34-84 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent 5,742,668 (Pepe) in view of Cook. According to the Office Action, Pepe teaches all of the elements of claims 1-31 and 34-84, except for a user profile of an authorized access of a plurality of authorized accesses. Thus, the Office Action combined the teachings of Cook and Pepe to yield all of the elements of claims 1-

31 and 34-84. The rejection is traversed as being based on references that neither teach nor suggest the novel combination of features clearly recited in independent claims 1, 34, 37, 68 and 78, each of which is discussed above.

Pepe relates to an electronic messaging network. Pepe describes a personal communications interworking (PCI) 40 connected between wireless network 39 and wireline network 29. PCI 40 permits the mobile communications subscriber to send and receive messages between disparate networks, messaging systems and a variety of service providers. Figure 3 of Pepe shows PCI 40 and a PCI database 44 that stores and updates subscriber profiles. Pepe describes that the PCI provides the subscriber with control over the message routing and delivery by the subscriber accessible "subscriber profile" stored in the PCI. The subscriber profile contains subscriber programmed instructions on message receipt, origination and notification. PCI 40 operates as a messaging gateway for providing access to multiple wireline and wireless networks, while using subscriber profile information to control sending and receiving options. PCI 40 allows wireless service providers to integrate the voice messaging, e-mail, and fax message services for one subscriber through a single telephone number. Thus, Pepe describes one phone number that provides a single link between the service provider and the subscriber's voice and data communications lines.

Pepe does not cure the deficiencies of Cook, as outline above. Specifically, Pepe does not teach or suggest providing an identification of the subscriber and an access of a plurality of accesses, to a visited network of a plurality of networks from a home network

of the subscriber, the access comprising an identification of access from the plurality of accesses to one of the plurality networks in which the subscriber is registered, as recited in the presently pending claims. Pepe also does not teach or suggest that access of the subscriber to the network is dependent upon a comparison of the access to be provided to the subscriber and the stored subscriber profile having the authorized access of the plurality of authorized accesses, as recited in the presently pending claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn because neither Cook nor Pepe, whether taken singly or combined, teaches or suggests each feature of claims 1, 34, 37, 68 and 78 and hence, dependent claims 2-33, 35, 36, 38-67, 69-77 and 79-84 thereon.

As noted previously, claims 1-84 recite subject matter which is neither disclosed nor suggested in the prior art references cited in the Office Action. It is therefore respectfully requested that all of claims 1-84 be allowed and this application passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Arlene P. Neal", is written over a horizontal line.

Arlene P. Neal

Registration No. 43,828

Customer No. 32294

SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP

14TH Floor

8000 Towers Crescent Drive

Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700

Telephone: 703-720-7800

Fax: 703-720-7802

APN:kzw